1	GEORGE J. TICHY, II, Bar No. 041146	
2	MICHELLE R. BARRETT, Bar No. 197280 PAUL R. LYND, Bar No. 202764	
3	LITTLER MENDELSON A Professional Corporation	
	650 California Street, 20th Floor	
.4	San Francisco, CA 94108.2693 Telephone: 415.433.1940	
5	Facsimile: 415.399.8490 E-mail: gtichy@littler.com, mbarrett@littler.	com,
6	plynd@littler.com	AUG 1 5 2007
7	Attorneys for Defendants	
8	HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA and HSBC BANK USA, N.A.	A)
9		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
2		
L3	PHILIP WONG, FREDERIC CHAUSSY,	Case No. C 07 2446 MMC
14	and LESLIE MARIE SHEARN, individually, on behalf of all others	DEFENDANT HSBC MORTGAGE
	similarly situated, and on behalf of the	CORPORATION (USA)'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' INTERROGATORIES
l5	general public,	(SET NO. ONE)
6	Plaintiffs,	
.7	v.	
8	HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA); HSBC BANK USA, N.A.; HSBC	
9	HOLDINGS, INC.; and DOES 1 through	
20	50, inclusive,	
21	Defendants.	
22		
		•
23		
24	,	
25	. • !	
26		EXHIBIT
27		tatpoles.

LITTLER MEMDELSON
A PROFESSIDAL CORPORATION
750 California Street
20th Floor
700 Francisco, CA 94503,2893
415,432,1940

DEF. HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA)'S RESP. TO INTERROGS. (SET #1)

CASE NO. C 07 2446 MMC

PROPOUNDING PARTY:

Plaintiffs PHILIP WONG, FREDERIC CHAUSSY, and

LESLIE MARIE SHEARN

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1

RESPONDING PARTY:

Defendant HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA)

SET NUMBER:

ONE

Defendant HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA) (hereinafter "Defendant") under oath, makes the following answers and objections to the written interrogatories propounded to it by Plaintiffs on July 11, 2007. The answers and objections are made solely for the purpose of this action. Each answer is subject to all objections as to competence, relevance, materiality, propriety, and admissibility, and any and all other objections and grounds that would require the exclusion of any statement if any interrogatories were asked of, or any statements contained herein were made by, a witness present and testifying in court, all of which objections and grounds are reserved and may be interposed at the time of trial.

The following answers are based upon information presently available to Defendant and, except for explicit facts admitted herein, no incidental or implied admissions are intended hereby. The fact that Defendant has answered or objected to any interrogatory or part thereof should not be taken as an admission that said Defendant accepts or admits the existence of any facts set forth or assumed by such interrogatories and that such answer or objection constitutes admissible evidence. The fact that Defendant has answered part or all of any interrogatory is not intended and shall not be construed to be a waiver by Defendant of all or any part of any objection to any interrogatory.

Defendant objects to each and every such interrogatory to the extent that any or all of the interrogatories call for information: (a) which constitutes information or material prepared in anticipation of litigation or for trial; (b) which constitutes information covered by the work product doctrine; (c) which constitutes information which is privileged by virtue of the attorney-client privilege, or (d) which constitutes information which is privileged or related to confidential trade secrets or the privilege of privacy (including the freedom of association and financial privacy). Defendant thus will not supply or render any information or material protected from discovery by

virtue of the work product doctrine, the attorney-client privilege, privacy privilege or doctrine protecting trade secret, proprietary or confidential information.

The above-stated objections are hereby made applicable to each and all of these interrogatories and are hereby, as to each and all of them, incorporated by reference as if fully set forth therein.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORIES

INTERROGATORY NO. 1:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

With respect to the person signing these Interrogatories please identify the person's name, business address, and job title.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Michelle R. Barrett, Shareholder of the law firm Littler Mendelson, P.C., 650 California Street, 20th Floor, San Francisco, California 94108 is signing the responses to these Interrogatories.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2:

Identify all persons who you believe have any information or knowledge with respect to any facts or matters relating to the allegations in the Complaint or your Answer.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad and not sufficiently limited in scope. Defendant also objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is vague and ambiguous with respect to the words and/or phrases "all persons who have any information with respect to any facts or matters." Requesting information from anyone with information in regards to any element of this case is overbroad. Defendant objects on the grounds that Plaintiff's request is unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs'

5 6

7

9 10

12

13

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2223

24

25

26

2728

LITTLER MENDELSON
A Professional Confession
650 California Steed

attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved. Further, Defendant objects to this request as Defendant has not yet answered Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint.

INTERROGATORY NO. 3:

With respect to each person identified in Interrogatory #2, identify and describe what information you believe each person may possess.

<u>RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3:</u>

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad and not sufficiently limited in scope. Defendant further objects that on the grounds that it is unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved. Defendant further objects to this request on the grounds that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4:

Identify all managers responsible for directly supervising Plaintiffs during the applicable statutory period, including for each his/her name, address, telephone number, job title, the Plaintiff(s) supervised by him/her, the location at which he/she supervised each Plaintiff, and the dates he/she supervised each Plaintiff.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein.

Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks

7

10 11

12

13

15

14

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant further objects to this request on the grounds that it is unduly burdensome and oppressive and further calls for a narrative response that could be accomplished through other less burdensome means of discovery. Defendant further objects to this request on the grounds that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant objects to this request on the ground that, to the extent it requests addresses and telephone numbers of third parties, it seeks to invade the privacy of third parties without compelling need therefor. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4: [SIC]

Identify each position title utilized at Defendant during the statutory period for non-management employees (i.e., employees who, on a day-to-day basis, are not expected to spend greater than 50% of their time engaged in the management of other employees), describe the duties performed by each, and state whether each position is classified as exempt or non-exempt.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4: [SIC]

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase and/or term "utilized" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant further objects to this request on the grounds that it is unduly burdensome and oppressive and further calls for a narrative response that could be accomplished through other less burdensome means of discovery. Defendant also objects to this request on the grounds that it calls for legal argument and legal conclusions. Defendant further objects to this request on the grounds that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Strike has not been resolved.

OGATORY NO. 5: [SIC]

Identify the number of employees employed by Defendant during the statutory period in the following positions:

Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to

- Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants;
- Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants; b.
- Senior Field Administrators; and
- Field Administrators. d.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5: [SIC]

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant objects on the grounds that this request is overbroad. Defendant further objects to this request on the grounds that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant objects to this request on the ground that it is compound. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6: [SIC]

Identify each employee employed by Defendant during the statutory period in the position titles listed in Interrogatory 5, stating all position titles each employee held and dates of employment of each person in each position.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 6: [SIC]

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad. Defendant further objects to this request on the grounds that it is unduly burdensome and oppressive and further calls for a narrative response that could be accomplished through other less burdensome means of discovery.

Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved. In addition, Defendant objects to this request to the extent that it requires Defendant to create information not already in existence. Defendant further objects on the grounds that it is unduly burdensome and oppressive.

<u>INTERROGATORY NO. 7</u>: [SIC]

Identify each of Defendant's branch/store locations at which Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and Field Administrators have been employed during the statutory period, the date each branch/store opened, and if the branch/store location is no longer open, the date it closed.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7: [SIC]

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant objects on the grounds that this request is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant further objects on the grounds that it is unduly burdensome and oppressive and further calls for a narrative response that could be accomplished through other less burdensome means of discovery. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8: [SIC]

For each branch/store location, identify the location of all notices, if any, posted by

6.

22

23

24

25

26

Defendants explaining to their employees the Fair Labor Standards Act.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 8: [SIC]

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant further objects to this request on the grounds that it is unduly burdensome and oppressive. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms "location," "Defendants" and "notices" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

INTERROGATORY NO. 9: [SIC]

Identify and describe Defendant's date of incorporation, State of incorporation, subsidiaries and parent company(ies) [This request includes the name, date of incorporation, State of incorporation of each subsidiary and parent company].

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 9: [SIC]

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant objects on the grounds that this information is equally available to Plaintiff as a matter of public record. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

For the statutory period, state the average weekly compensation that Defendant paid

1

INTERROGATORY NO. 10: [SIC]

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10: [SIC]

2

to Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and Field Administrators.

4

5

6 7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

. ._

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2627

28

2

DEF. HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA)'S RESP. TO INTERROGS. (SET #1)

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant objects on the grounds that the request for average weekly compensation is

overbroad and does not narrowly define the regions, offices, or individuals whose information would be pertinent to this lawsuit. Defendant further objects to this request on the grounds that it is unduly burdensome and oppressive and further calls for a narrative response that could be accomplished through other less burdensome means of discovery. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that the financial information sought is privileged and confidential under the constitutional right of privacy. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial

preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete

response at this stage. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant

to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's

Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

<u>INTERROGATORY NO. 11</u>: [SIC]

Identify all persons, by name, job title, dates of employment, and current job status, whose job included responsibility for determining, company-wide, Defendant's compliance with wage and hour laws during the last six years.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 11: [SIC]

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant objects on the ground that the words and/or phrases "responsibility for determining" and "compliance" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither

4 5

7

6

9

8

10 11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

2021

22

23_.

25

26

2728

LITTLER MENDELSON
A Processional Connoration
556 California Street,
20th Steor
ian Francisco, CA 94108,2883
415,433,1940

Defendant also objects to this request on the grounds that it calls for legal argument and legal conclusions. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that it seeks information which is equally available to Plaintiff. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

INTERROGATORY NO. 12: [SIC]

To the extent that Defendant is relying on attorney advice for any good faith defense to liquidated damages and willful conduct, identify the attorney(s), and describe all conversations and correspondence that were relied upon.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 12: [SIC]

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that the information requested is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. Defendant also objects on the grounds that the words and/or phrases "relying" and "attorney advice" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is premature and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant also objects to this request on the grounds that it calls for legal argument and legal conclusions. Additionally, Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that the information sought seeks defense counsel's legal analysis and theories regarding the law. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

INTERROGATORY NO. 13: [SIC]

Identify and describe all written administrative regulations, orders, rulings, approvals, or interpretations or administrative practice or enforcement policies relied upon by Defendant in

3

4 5

7

6

9 10

8

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

19

20 21

22

23

24

25 26

27

justifying their method of compensating Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and Field Administrators.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 13: [SIC]

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that the information requested is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work product doctrine. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is premature and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant also objects to this request on the grounds that it calls for legal argument and legal conclusions. Additionally, Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that the information sought seeks defense counsel's legal analysis and theories regarding the law. Defendant objects on the grounds that the terms and/or phrases "practice or enforcement policies," "relied upon," and "justified" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

INTERROGATORY NO. 14: [SIC]

Identify all judicial or other administrative proceedings, lawsuits, investigations, or inquiries of any kind of Defendant relating to employees' wages or hours worked, including but not limited to any investigation conducted by any state or federal wage and hour department.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 14: [SIC]

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

14

13

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

2425

26

27

28

ITTLER MENDELSON
PROFESSIONAL GERPOARTON
650 CAIDITORIA SCURIL
2016 Floor
Francisco, CA 34108.2693
415.103.1940
USA)'S RE

that the phrases and/or terms "investigations," "inquiries," "of any kind of Defendant" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant objects to this request on the ground that it is unintelligible. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

<u>INTERROGATORY NO. 15</u>: [SIC]

Identify any and all exhibits that may be introduced at trial or used as exhibits in deposition.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 15: [SIC]

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant further objects to this request on the grounds that it is unduly burdensome and oppressive and further calls for a narrative response that could be accomplished through other less burdensome means of discovery. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that the information sought seeks defense counsel's legal analysis and theories regarding the law. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

INTERROGATORY NO. 16: [SIC]

Identify any and all witnesses who may be called at trial.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 16: [SIC]

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein.

Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that the information sought seeks defense counsel's legal analysis and theories regarding the law. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

INTERROGATORY NO. 17: [SIC]

Identify any expert witness you may call at trial and provide the facts known or opinions held by the expert consistent with Rule 26(b)(4) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17: [SIC]

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant further objects to this request on the grounds that it is unduly burdensome and oppressive and further calls for a narrative response that could be accomplished through other less burdensome means of discovery. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that the information sought seeks defense counsel's legal analysis and theories. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

INTERROGATORY NO. 18: [SIC]

Describe in detail the process in which Defendant classified Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and Field Administrators as exempt and/or non-exempt employees, including when the decision was made, the reason(s) for the decision, identification of those involved in the decision-making process, and the

12.

3

information relied upon in making the decision.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 18: [SIC]

4 5 and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely 6 7 and/or terms "process," "decision-making process" and "relied upon" are vague and ambiguous. 8 9 10

11 12

14

13

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28

ITTLER MENDELSON

DEF. HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA)'S RESP. TO INTERROGS. (SET #1)

Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein.

to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases

Defendant also objects to this request on the grounds that it calls for legal argument and legal

conclusions. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that the information sought seeks defense counsel's legal analysis and theories regarding the law. Defendant also objects on the

ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot

reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant objects to this

request on the ground that it is compound. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and

prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not

ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been

resolved.

Dated: August 13, 2007

Firmwide:82789884.2 023404.1043

LITTLER MENDELSON A Professional Corporation

Attorneys for Defendants

HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA)

and HSBC BANK USA, N.A.

CASE NO. C 07 2446 MMC

1	GEORGE J. TICHY, II, Bar No. 041146 MICHELLE R. BARRETT, Bar No. 197280	
2	PAUL R. LYND, Bar No. 202764 LITTLER MENDELSON	
3	A Professional Corporation 650 California Street, 20th Floor	
4	San Francisco, CA 94108.2693	
5	Telephone: 415.433.1940 Facsimile: 415.399.8490	
6	E-mail: gtichy@littler.com, mbarrett@littler.com plynd@littler.com	AUG 1 5 2007
7	Attorneys for Defendants	дос 2
8	HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA) and HSBC BANK USA, N.A.	
9		
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
12	·	
13	PHILIP WONG, FREDERIC CHAUSSY,	Case No. C 07 2446 MMC
14	and LESLIE MARIE SHEARN, individually, on behalf of all others	DEFENDANT HSBC MORTGAGE
15	similarly situated, and on behalf of the general public,	CORPORATION (USA)'S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION (SET NO. ONE)
16	Plaintiffs,	TRODUCTION (SET NO. ONE)
17	v.	
18	HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION	
19	(USA); HSBC BANK USA, N.A.; HSBC HOLDINGS, INC.; and DOES 1 through	÷
20	50, inclusive,	
21	Defendants.	·
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

LITTLER MENDELSON
A Propressional Concornion
650 California Streat
20th Plaor
Jan Francisco, CA 94198, 2893
415 433,1940

DEF. HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA)'S RESP. TO REQ. FOR PROD. (SET #1)

PROPOUNDING PARTY:

Plaintiffs PHILIP WONG, FREDERIC CHAUSSY, and

LESLIE MARIE SHEARN

2

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1

RESPONDING PARTY:

Defendant HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA)

SET NUMBER:

ONE

Defendant HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA) (hereinafter "Defendant") hereby makes the following Response (including objections) to Plaintiffs' Request for Production of Documents. This Response is made solely for purposes of this action. Each response and/or production is subject to all objections as to competence, relevance, materiality, propriety and admissibility, and any and all other objections and grounds which would require the exclusion of any statements contained herein, if such statements were made by a witness present and testifying at court, all of which objections and grounds are reserved and may be interposed at the time of trial.

The following Response is based upon information presently available to Defendant. Defendant is not making any incidental or implied admissions regarding the contents of these documents. The fact that Defendant has responded or objected to any request or part thereof should not be taken as an admission that Defendant accepts or admits the existence of any fact set forth or assumed by Plaintiffs' request, or that such response or objection constitutes admissible evidence. The fact that Defendant has answered part or all of any request is not intended and shall not be construed to be a waiver by Defendant of all or any part of any objections to any request.

Defendant objects to each and every such interrogatory to the extent that any or all of the requests call for information: (a) which constitutes information or material prepared in anticipation of litigation or for trial; (b) which constitutes information covered by the work product doctrine; (c) which constitutes information which is privileged by virtue of the attorney-client privilege, or (d) which constitutes information which is privileged or related to confidential trade secrets or the privilege of privacy (including the freedom of association and financial privacy). Defendant thus will not supply or render any information or material protected from discovery by virtue of the work product doctrine, the attorney-client privilege, privacy privilege or doctrine protecting trade secret, proprietary or confidential information.

2

3

4 5

6

8

9

7

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

TTEER MENDELSON SHORAL CORPORATION 20th Floor ises, CA 94108.2693 15,433 1940

All of the responses made herein are made subject to the objections stated above and any further objection specifically stated.

RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:

A list, in Excel format, of all persons employed by Defendant as Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and/or Field Administrators at any of Defendant's locations within the applicable statutory period, including for each his/her name, address, telephone number, dates of employment as a Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and/or Field Administrators, location of employment, employee number, and last four digits of their social security number. For this Request, the relevant statutory period begins six years prior to the date of the filing of this complaint for New York employees, four years for California employees, and three years elsewhere, and continues until the present.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. In addition, Defendant objects to this request on the ground that, to the extent it requests addresses and telephone numbers of third parties, it seeks to invade the privacy interest of third parties without compelling need therefore. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information about individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to this request to the extent that it requires Defendant to create information not already in existence. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide named Plaintiffs with an Excel document identifying named location of employment, and employee number.

Plaintiffs' personnel files.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:

Plaintiffs, their job titles, dates of employment as a Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultant,

Retail Mortgage Lending Consultant, Senior Field Administrator, and/or Field Administrator,

addition. Defendant objects to this request on the ground that, to the extent it requests addresses and

telephone numbers of third parties, it seeks to invade the privacy interest of third parties without

compelling need therefore. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that the financial

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. In

1 2

3

5

6

4

7 8

10

11

9

12 13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

LER MENDELSON

information sought is privileged and confidential under the constitutional right of privacy. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information about individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase and/or term "personnel files" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in

discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide named Plaintiffs' personnel files.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:

alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

A list, in Excel format, of all persons employed by Defendant at the locations in which Plaintiffs worked, including for each his/her name, address, telephone number, job title, dates of employment, location of employment, and current employment status.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. In addition, Defendant objects to this request on the ground that, to the extent it requests addresses and telephone numbers of third parties, it seeks to invade the privacy interest of third parties without compelling need therefore. Defendant also objects on the grounds that it is unduly burdensome and oppressive and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information about individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to this request to the extent that it requires Defendant to create information not already in existence. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:

A list, in Excel format, of all persons employed by Defendant responsible for directly supervising Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and/or Field Administrators during the applicable statutory period, including for each his/her name, address, telephone number, job title, dates of employment in that position, location managed, and current employment status.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. In addition, Defendant objects to this request on the ground that, to the extent it requests addresses and telephone numbers of third parties, it seeks to invade the privacy interest of third parties without compelling need therefore. Defendant also objects on the grounds that it is unduly burdensome and oppressive and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor

1:7

DEF. HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA)'S RESP. TO REQ. FOR PROD. (SET #1)

reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to this request to the extent that it requires Defendant to create information not already in existence. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide named Plaintiffs with an Excel document identifying all persons employed by Defendant responsible for directly supervising named Plaintiffs. This list shall include the supervisors' names, job titles, dates of employment in that position, location managed (if any), and current employment status.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:

A list, in Excel format, of all persons employed by Defendant responsible for directly supervising, during the statutory period, those deemed responsible for supervising Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and/or Field Administrators identified in Interrogatory No. 4 above, including for each his/her name, address, telephone number, job title, dates of employment in that position, area or region managed, and current employment status.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. In addition, Defendant objects to this request on the ground that, to the extent it requests addresses and telephone numbers of third parties, it seeks to invade the privacy interest of third parties without compelling need therefore. Defendant also objects on the grounds that it is unduly burdensome and oppressive and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor

DEF. HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA)'S RESP. TO REQ. FOR PROD. (SET #1)

reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase "responsible for directly supervising, during the statutory period, those deemed responsible for supervising" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant objects to this request on the ground that it is unintelligible. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant objects to this request to the extent that it requires Defendant to create information not already in existence. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide named Plaintiffs with an Excel document identifying all persons employed by Defendant who are responsible for directly supervising named Plaintiffs' direct supervisors. This list shall include the individuals' names, job titles, dates of employment in that position, area or region managed (if any), and current employment status.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:

All documents that identify or describe Defendant's hierarchical structure, during the applicable statutory period, including but not limited to its divisions or departments, the job titles within the structure, and the persons holding board, officer, and management positions within the structure.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects to this request on the ground that,

to the extent it requests addresses and telephone numbers of third parties, it seeks to invade the privacy of third parties without compelling need therefor. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7:

All compensation plans and other documents relating to Defendant's policies, procedures, or methods of compensating Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and Field Administrators during the applicable statutory period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant objects on the grounds that this information is equally available to Plaintiffs. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms "compensation plans," "policies, procedures, or methods," and "compensating" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant objects to this request on the ground that, to the extent it requests addresses and telephone numbers of third parties, it seeks to invade the privacy of third parties without compelling need therefor. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that the financial information sought is privileged and confidential under the constitutional right of privacy. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks

Page 22 of 52

1

4

6 7

5

8 9

10 11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide named Plaintiffs' with all compensation plans and other nonprivileged documents describing the method of compensation applicable to each named Plaintiff, subject to a mutually agreed upon Protective Order.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8:

All documents relating to any changes in Defendant's policies, procedures or methods of paying Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and Field Administrators in the last six years.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant objects on the grounds that this information is equally available to Plaintiffs. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms "changes," "policies, procedures, or methods," and "paying" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant objects to this request on the ground that, to the extent it requests addresses and telephone numbers of third parties, it seeks to invade the privacy of third parties without compelling need therefor. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that the financial information sought is privileged and confidential under the constitutional right of privacy. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who

8.

б

9

11

12 13

14 15

1617

18 19

20

21

2223

24

25

26

27

28

LITTLER MENOELSON
A PROVISSIONAL COMPORATION
650 Califeraia Street
20th Floor
an Francisco CA 94100.2693

DEF. HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA)'S RESP. TO REQ. FOR PROD. (SET #1)

discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all non-privileged documents related to any changes to named Plaintiffs' compensation, compensation plans or pay, subject to a mutually agreed upon Protective Order.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9:

All records, in Excel format, of compensation paid to Plaintiffs during the applicable statutory period, per week and per pay period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant objects on the grounds that Plaintiffs are seeking information which is equally available to Plaintiffs. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase and/or term "records [] of compensation paid" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant objects to this request on the ground that, to the extent it requests addresses and telephone numbers of third parties, it seeks to invade the privacy of third parties without compelling need therefor. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that the financial information sought is privileged and confidential under the constitutional right of privacy. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant objects to this request to the extent that it

requires Defendant to create information not already in existence. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide named Plaintiffs with an Excel document, if generation of such a document is possible without manually inputting information into an Excel spreadsheet, compensation paid to named Plaintiffs during their employment with Defendant, per week and per pay period.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:

All documents containing, identifying or describing all communications between Defendant and Plaintiffs relating to their compensation, hours of work, and overtime.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the grounds that Plaintiffs are seeking information which is equally available to Plaintiffs. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms "containing, identifying, or describing," "communications," "compensation," "hours of work" and "overtime" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant objects to this request on the ground that, to the extent it requests addresses and telephone numbers of third parties, it seeks to invade the privacy of third parties without compelling need therefor. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that the financial information sought is privileged and confidential under the constitutional right of privacy. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial

10.

5 6

7

9 10

11

12

13 14

15 16

1**7**

18

19

2021

22

23

24

25

2627

28

LITTLER MENDELSON

A PROPERSIONAL CORPORATION

650 California Street

the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all non-privileged documents containing, identifying or

preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete

response at this stage. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all non-privileged documents containing, identifying or describing all communications between Defendant and named Plaintiffs relating to their compensation, hours of work, and overtime.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:

All timesheets or other documents identifying or describing the hours worked by Plaintiffs during the statutory period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the grounds that Plaintiffs are seeking information which is equally available to Plaintiffs. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase and/or term "hours worked" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant objects to this request on the ground that, to the extent it requests addresses and telephone numbers of third parties, it seeks to invade the privacy of third parties without compelling need therefor. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that the financial information sought is privileged and confidential under the constitutional right of privacy. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in

LITTLER MENDELSON
A Professional Componation
950 California Street
20th Floor
ian Francisco, CA 94108 2693
415 433 1940

the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all timesheets and other non-privileged documents identifying or describing the hours worked by named Plaintiffs.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:

All schedules or other documents identifying or describing the anticipated schedules to be worked by Plaintiffs during the statutory period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the grounds that Plaintiffs are seeking information which is equally available to Plaintiffs. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase and/or term "anticipated schedules" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all schedules and non-privileged documents identifying or describing the anticipated schedules to be worked by named Plaintiffs.

All phone logs, records, bills, or other documents identifying or describing the date

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein.

Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the

attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad

and unduly burdensome and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant

action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on

the grounds that Plaintiffs are seeking information which is equally available to Plaintiffs.

Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase and/or term "telephone activity" is vague and

ambiguous. Defendant objects to this request on the ground that, to the extent it requests addresses

and telephone numbers of third parties, it seeks to invade the privacy of third parties without

compelling need therefor. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and

that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a

complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is

overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties

to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the

action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to

participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion

follows: Defendant agrees to provide all non-privileged phone logs, non-privileged records, bills, or

other non-privileged documents identifying or describing the date and time of named Plaintiffs'

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as

All computer logs, records, reports or other documents demonstrating the starting and

to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

1

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:

2 3

and time of Plaintiffs' telephone activity during the statutory period.

4

5

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13:

6

7

20

21 22

25

telephone activity.

26

DEF. HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA)'S RESP. TO REQ. FOR PROD. (SET #1)

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14:

13.

ending times of Plaintiffs' computer activity during each day of the statutory period.

23

24

27

28

TTLER MENDELSON

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24.

25

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the grounds that Plaintiffs are seeking information which is equally available to Plaintiffs. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms "records," "demonstrating" and "computer activity" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant objects to this request on the ground that, to the extent it requests addresses and telephone numbers of third parties, it seeks to invade the privacy of third parties without compelling need therefor. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that the financial information sought is privileged and confidential under the constitutional right of privacy. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant objects to this request to the extent that Defendant to create information not already in existence. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all non-privileged computer logs, non-privileged records, non-privileged reports, or other non-privileged documents demonstrating the starting and ending times of named Plaintiffs' computer activity.

26

27

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:

All email or other electronic messages sent to or from Plaintiffs through Defendant's email or computer systems regarding or in any way relating to their hours worked, overtime, and meals and rest periods during the applicable statutory period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the grounds that Plaintiffs are seeking information which is equally available to Plaintiffs. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase and/or term "regarding or in any way relating to their hours works, overtime, and meal and rest periods" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all emails or electronic message sent to or from named Plaintiffs through Defendant's email or computer system regarding or related to named Plaintiffs' hours worked, overtime, and meal and rest periods.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:

All emails or other electronic messages sent to or from Plaintiffs' supervisors through Defendant's email or computer systems during the statutory period regarding or in any way relating to Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants', Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants', Senior

3

4 5

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

DEF. HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA)'S RESP. TO REQ. FOR PROD. (SET #1)

16.

CASE NO. C 07 2446 MMC

Field Administrators', and/or Field Administrators' hours worked, overtime, and meals and rest periods during the applicable statutory period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase and/or term "regarding or in any way relating to Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants', Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants', Senior Field Administrators', and/or Field Administrators' hours worked, overtime, and meals and rest periods" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that the financial information sought is privileged and confidential under the constitutional right of privacy. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all non-privileged emails and other non-privileged email messages sent to or from named Plaintiffs' supervisors through Defendant's email or computer systems regarding or in any way relating to named Plaintiffs' hours worked, overtime, and meals and rest periods during the applicable statutory period.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:

All time-stamped documents, including closing documents, security logs, faxes, or other documents that provide an identifiable time for the beginning and ending of work-related activity by Plaintiffs that have not been identified and produced in connection with Interrogatories Nos. 12-16.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase and/or term "an identifiable time for the beginning and ending of work-related activity by Plaintiffs" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant objects to this request on the ground that, to the extent it requests addresses and telephone numbers of third parties, it seeks to invade the privacy of third parties without compelling need therefor. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that the financial information sought is privileged and confidential under the constitutional right of privacy. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all non-privileged time-stamped documents, closing documents, security logs, or other non-privileged documents that provide an identifiable time for the beginning and ending of work-related activity by named Plaintiffs.

REOUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18:

All official, published job descriptions identifying or describing the job duties and responsibilities of any non-management positions (i.e., employees who, on a day-to-day basis, are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

3

4 5

6

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

not expected to spend greater than 50% of their time engaged in the management of other employees) during the applicable statutory period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:

All job postings, advertisements, or other vacancy listings identifying and describing the Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultant, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultant, Senior Field Administrator, and/or Field Administrator positions during the applicable statutory period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase and/or term "vacancy listings" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26 27

28

TLER MENDELSON

DEF. HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA)'S RESP. TO REQ. FOR PROD. (SET #1)

to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as Defendant agrees to provide job postings, advertisements, or other vacancy listings identifying and describing the positions held by named Plaintiffs.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20:

All orientation materials provided to Plaintiffs upon their hire.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase and/or term "orientation materials" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that the trade secret or proprietary information sought is privileged and confidential. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all orientation materials provided to named Plaintiffs, subject to a mutually agreed upon Protective Order.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 21:

All training materials provided to Plaintiffs during their employment.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 21:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase and/or term "training material" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that the trade secret or proprietary information sought is privileged and confidential. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all training materials provided to named Plaintiffs, subject to a mutually agreed upon Protective Order.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 22:

All policy, procedure or employee rules, handbooks, or manuals in effect and applicable to Plaintiffs during the statutory period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 22:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase and/or term "policy, procedure, or employees rules, handbooks or manuals" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that the trade secret or proprietary information sought is

privileged and confidential. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and

LITTLER MENDELSON

4 PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

650 California Street

DEF. HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA)'S RESP. TO REQ. FOR PROD. (SET #1)

that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all policy, procedure or employee rules, handbooks, or manuals in effect and applicable to named Plaintiffs, subject to a mutually agreed upon Protective Order.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 23:

All documents used generally by Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and Field Administrators in the performance of their jobs, including any standard manuals, charts, graphs, matrixes, instructions, directions, rules, policies, or procedures.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 23:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase and/or term "in the performance of their jobs, including any standard manuals, charts, graphs, matrixes, instructions, directions, rules, policies, or procedures" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that the trade secret or proprietary information sought is privileged and confidential. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and

21.

1

5 6

8

9

7

10

11

12 13

14

15

17

16

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

TTLER MENDELSON

DEF. HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION DIEGO, CA 94105.2893 415 433 1940

therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all documents, including any standard manuals, charts, graphs, matrixes, instructions, directions, rules, policies, or procedures, used by named Plaintiffs in performing their jobs, subject to a mutually agreed upon Protective Order.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 24:

All documents that rank or otherwise compare or contrast Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants', Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants', Senior Field Administrators', and/or Field Administrators' performance within each location, area, region or nationally.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 24:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms "rank or otherwise compare or contrast" and "performance" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that the financial information sought is privileged and confidential under the constitutional right of privacy. Defendant further objects to this request on the ground that the trade secret or proprietary information sought is privileged and confidential. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it

22.

3

4 5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

1415

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

2526

27

28

LITTLER MENOELSON
A Professional Corrolation
650 Colliforms Street
20th Stop
1as Francisco, CA 94108 2693

is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all non-privileged documents that rank or otherwise compare or contrast named Plaintiffs' performance, subject to a mutually agreed upon Protective Order.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 25:

All documents relating to Defendant's decision not to pay Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and/or Field Administrators overtime compensation.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 25:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms "decision not to pay" and "overtime compensation" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 26:

All documents that identify or describe all efforts taken by Defendant to comply with the Fair Labor Standards Act and other state wage and hour laws relating to overtime compensation.

2

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 26:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms "efforts taken by," "overtime compensation" and "comply" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 27:

(USA)'S RESP. TO REQ. FOR PROD. (SET #1)

All documents that identify, describe, or relate to any claim that Defendant's method of compensating Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and Field Administrators was performed with a good faith reasonable belief that it was complying with the Fair Labor Standards Act and other state wage and hour laws relating to overtime compensation.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 27:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms "method of compensating," "good faith reasonable belief," and "overtime DEF. HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION

compensation" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 28:

All documents that identify, describe or relate to any claim made by Defendant that it relied on attorney advice for any claim that their method of compensating Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and Field Administrators was performed with a good faith reasonable belief that it was complying with the Fair Labor Standards Act and other state wage and hour laws relating to overtime compensation.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 28:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms "relied," "method of compensating," "good faith reasonable belief," "complying" and "overtime compensation" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to

27 28

20

21

22

23

24

25

require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 29:

All documents relating to oral or written complaints or inquiries by any Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and Field Administrators regarding Defendant's methods of compensation during the last ten years.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 29:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms "complaints or inquiries" and "methods of compensation" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all non-privileged documents relating to oral or written complaints or inquiries made by named Plaintiffs regarding Defendant's methods of compensation.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 30:

All documents relating to oral or written complaints or inquiries, lawsuits or administrative filings made by any Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage

3

4 5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 28

DEF. HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA)'S RESP. TO REQ. FOR PROD. (SET #1)

methods of compensation during the last ten years.

Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and Field Administrators regarding Defendant's

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 30:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms "complaints or inquiries" and "methods of compensation" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all non-privileged documents relating to oral or written complaints or inquiries, or administrative filings made by named Plaintiffs regarding Defendant's methods of compensation.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 31:

All documents relating to any contact between Defendant and the Department of Labor or any other federal or state government agency regarding Defendant's compensation practices during the last ten years.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 31:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the

27.

attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms "contact" and "compensation practices" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all non-privileged documents relating to any contact between Defendant and the Department of Labor or any other federal or state government agency regarding named Plaintiffs and Defendant's compensation practices.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 32:

All documents containing, identifying or describing all communications between Defendant and any Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and/or Field Administrators relating to this lawsuit.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 32:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase and/or term "communications" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be

3

5

6 7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

2526

27

28

ITTLER MENDELSON PROFESSIONAL GORFORATION

DEF. HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION

(USA)'S RESP. TO REQ. FOR PROD. (SET #1)

ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as

expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all non-privileged documents containing, identifying or describing all communications between Defendant and named Plaintiffs relating to this lawsuit.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 33:

All documents that may be offered into evidence at trial or depositions or may be used to refresh the recollection of a witness at depositions or trial.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 33:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that the information sought seeks defense counsel's legal analysis and theories regarding the law. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase and/or term "may be offered" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 34:

All statements of witnesses or potential witnesses or persons interviewed in connection with this case.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 34:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that the information sought seeks defense counsel's legal analysis and theories regarding the law. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase and/or term "interviewed in connection" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 35:

All documents relied upon or reviewed by Defendant's expert witnesses in forming his/her opinions in this matter.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 35:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that the information sought seeks defense counsel's legal analysis and theories regarding the law. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither 1 re 2 D 3 or 4 st 5 in 6 ol 7 in 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 36:

All documents obtained as a result of releases and/or subpoenas relating to this case.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 36:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant further objects to this request on the basis of the attorney work product doctrine and the attorney-client privilege. Defendant objects to this request on the grounds that the information sought seeks defense counsel's legal analysis and theories regarding the law. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrase and/or term "as a result of releases and/or subpoenas" is vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

28

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 37:

All documents not produced in response to prior Requests containing guidance provided during the statutory period to Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and/or Field Administrators regarding the taking of meal breaks.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 37:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms "guidance provided" and "taking of meal breaks" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all non-privileged documents not produced in response to prior Requests containing guidance provided to named Plaintiffs' regarding the taking of meal breaks, subject to a mutually agreed upon Protective Order.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 38:

All documents not produced in response to prior Requests containing guidance provided during the statutory period to Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and/or Field Administrators regarding the taking of rest periods.

115 133,1940 .

LITTLER MENDELSON A PROFESSIONAL COSPORATION BSD California Street 20th Floor ian Francisco, CA 94108-2693

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms "guidance provided" and "taking of rest periods" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all non-privileged documents not produced in response to prior Requests containing guidance provided to named Plaintiffs' regarding the taking of rest periods, subject to a mutually agreed upon Protective Order.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 39:

All documents not produced in response to prior Requests containing guidance provided during the statutory period to Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and/or Field Administrators regarding compensation for missed or interrupted rest periods.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 39:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein.

Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the

33.

3

5

4

6 7

8 9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

JITTLER MENDELSON

discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms "guidance provided" and "missed or interrupted rest periods" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all non-privileged documents not produced in response to prior Requests containing guidance provided to named Plaintiffs' regarding missed or interrupted rest periods, subject to a mutually agreed upon Protective Order.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 40:

All documents not produced in response to prior Requests containing guidance provided during the statutory period to Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and/or Field Administrators regarding the taking of rest periods.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 40:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms "guidance provided" and "taking of rest periods" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to

2011 F6001 :1500. CA 94108.2693 185 433 1940 DEF. HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA)'S RESP. TO REQ. FOR PROD. (SET #1)

individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as follows: Defendant agrees to provide all non-privileged documents not produced in response to prior Requests containing guidance provided to named Plaintiffs' regarding the taking of rest periods, subject to a mutually agreed upon Protective Order.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 41:

All documents not produced in response to prior Requests containing guidance provided during the statutory period to Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and/or Field Administrators regarding compensation for missed rest periods.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 41:

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms "guidance provided" and "compensation for missed rest periods" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant also objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs' attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover, the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has not been resolved.

35.

CASE NO. C 07 2446 MMC

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as

All documents not produced in response to prior Requests containing guidance

Defendant incorporates its General Objections as though set forth fully herein.

follows: Defendant agrees to provide all non-privileged documents not produced in response to

prior Requests containing guidance provided to named Plaintiffs' regarding compensation for missed

provided during the statutory period to Senior Retail Mortgage Lending Consultants, Retail

Mortgage Lending Consultants, Senior Field Administrators, and/or Field Administrators regarding

Defendant also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks

information which is neither relevant to the instant action nor reasonably likely to lead to the

discovery of admissible evidence. Defendant objects on the ground that the phrases and/or terms

"guidance provided" and "compensation for overtime" are vague and ambiguous. Defendant also

objects on the ground that discovery is not complete and that trial preparation is ongoing, and

Defendant cannot reasonably be expected to formulate a complete response at this stage. Defendant

also objects to this request on the ground that it is overbroad and therefore seeks information related

to individuals who are not yet confirmed as parties to this lawsuit. Defendant objects to Plaintiffs'

attempt to conduct discovery at this stage in the action as it is premature, inappropriate, unduly

burdensome and prejudicial to require Defendant to participate in discovery at this time. Moreover,

the request is not ripe because Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or alternatively, Motion to Strike has

compensation for overtime.

rest periods, subject to a mutually agreed upon Protective Order.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 42:

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 42:

1 2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

// -

II

//

//

25

26

DEF. HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA)'S RESP. TO REQ. FOR PROD. (SET #1)

not been resolved.

27 28 TTLER MENDELSON

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Defendant responds as 1 follows: Defendant agrees to provide all non-privileged documents not produced in response to 2 prior Requests containing guidance provided to named Plaintiffs' regarding compensation for 3 overtime, subject to a mutually agreed upon Protective Order. 4 5 Dated: August 13, 2007 6 7 8 LITTLER MENDELSON 9 A Professional Corporation Attorneys for Defendants 10 HSBC MORTGAGE CORPORATION (USA) and HSBC BANK USA, N.A. 11 12 Firmwide:82791320.1 023404.1043 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

LITTLER MENDELSON
A Professional Conformation
650 California Streat
20th Figur
Fancisco, CA 94169,2693
445,433 1940